UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,949	09/23/2003	Osman Ahmed	2003P14526US	3299

7590 07/05/2007	EXAMINER
Siemens Corporation	OMOSEWO, OLUBUSOLA
Intellectual Property Department	
170 Wood Avenue South	
Iselin, NJ 08830	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/668,949	AHMED ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		OLUBUSOLA ONI	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 February 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Reopening Prosecution After Appeal

1.   Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal Brief or Reply Brief

In view of the appeal brief filed on 01/17/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of

the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37

CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an

appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal

brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37

CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must

pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by

signing below:

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1, 5,15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Balakrishnan, Prabaharan. (Patent No. 6,711,579) hereinafter "Balakrishnan".

For claims 1 and 15, Balakrishnan teaches "a system for a building system application

comprising: a database"(Fig. 5); "a data provider interface for converting between a

common database access method and a database application programming interface

(API)" ([Col. 17, lines 45-49] wherein response could be received using protocols other than

the request protocol); and "an application infrastructure, the infrastructure comprising: "a

system design converter for converting application definition data into computer statements

for implementing control logic of application definition data" (Fig. 5, SB servlet 38)"a

computer tool interface coupled to the system design converter, the computer tool interface

providing the system design converter with data from the database through the data

provider interface" (Fig. 5, wherein request are sent through the request generator 30 to the SB servlet 38 (system design converter)

an external program module interface coupled to the system design converter, the external program module interface providing the system design converter with external program modules([Col. 17, lines 50-54, Fig. 5] wherein the external server is coupled to the SB servlet) and the system design converter includes data obtained through the computer tool interface and external program modules obtained through the external program module interface with the computer statements for implementing control logic of application definition data to generate a building system application" ([Col. 22, lines 38-44]).

For claim 5, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Balakrishnan teaches "external program module interface further comprising: common components for application support" (Col. 22, lines 38-44)

For claim 19, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 15 above. Balakrishnan teaches "coupling common components to the computer statements for implementing control logic of application definition data for communication support" (Col. 4, lines 38-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim 2, 3, 6-14, 16, 17and 19-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Balakrishnan, Prabaharan as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gloudeman et al. (Patent No. 6,141,595) "hereinafter Gloudeman"

For claim 2, Balakrishnan does not explicitly teach "wherein the database is comprised of a plurality of databases".

However, Gloudeman teaches "wherein the database is comprised of a plurality of databases (Col.5, lines 10-19)

        Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Balakrishnan's teachings with Gloudeman's teachings of database comprising real-time database and building automation system, which maintains a wide variety of different data stores and allows the system to generate a wide variety of different informational reports, flexible querying and data analysis.

For claim 3, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 2 above. Gloudeman teaches "the database being comprised of a real-time database and a data mart" (Col. 5, 20-26, fig. 2).

For claim 6, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Gloudeman teaches "Web-based components for coupling

the computer statement for implementing the control logic of the application definition

data to another application over the Internet" (Col. 4, lines 12-24).

For claim 7, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above

for rejected claim 1 above. Gloudeman teaches "operating system communication

components for coupling the computer statements for implementing the control logic of

the application definition data to another application through an operating system" (Col.

4, lines 58-Col.5, lines 1-9).

For claim 8, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above

for rejected claim 7 above. Gloudeman teaches "wherein the operating system

communication components communicated through a Windows operating system" ([Col.

4, lines 12-24, Col. 4, lines 58-Col.5, lines 1-9]).

For claim 9, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above

for rejected claim 6 above. Gloudeman teaches "wherein the Web-based components

couple the computer statements for implementing the control logic of the application

definition data to another application over the Internet through a customer web portal" ([Col.

4, lines 12-24] wherein Gloudeman teaches the user can interact with the building

automation system through different user interfaces, such as a browser. The user

interface can be connected to the building automation system by the internet which,

could lead to a site on the world wide web that typically provides personalized

capabilities to users of the building automated system, and providing a pathway to other content (personal /web portal)).

For claim 10, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Gloudeman teaches "a configuration utility for developing a file structure representative of a building system and for associating configuration data with components identified in the file structure" (Col. 5, lines 27-61).

For claim 11, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Gloudeman teaches "a data collector interface for coupling external data sources to the database" (Col. 4, lines 58-Col. 5, lines 1-9).

For claim 12, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 11 above. Gloudeman teaches "wherein the data collector interface converts data from the native format for an external data source to one that is compatible with the database structure" (Col. 4, lines 58-Col. 5, lines 1-9).

For claim 13, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 12 above. Gloudeman teaches "transaction services for generating instructions for the database API to store the converted data in the database" (Col. 4, lines 58-Col. 5, lines 9, Col.5, lines 39-60).

For claim 14, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 11above. Gloudeman teaches "a scheduling service for activating the data collector interface to interrogate the external data sources for data to be stored in the database" ([Col. 5, lines 39-61] wherein the optimization application layer updates attributes stored in the building system data store).

For claims 16, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 17, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 15 above. Gloudeman teaches "wherein the storing of data in the database includes storing the data in one of a real-time database and a data mart (Col. 5, 20-26, fig. 2).

For claim 19, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 15 above. Gloudeman teaches "coupling common components to the computer statements for implementing control logic of application definition data for communication support" (Col. 4, lines 25-57).

For claim 20, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 19 above. Gloudeman teaches "coupling the computer statements for implementing control logic of application definition data to another

application through a Web-based component for communication over the Internet" (Col. 4,
lines 12-24).

For claim 21, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give
above for rejected claim 19 above. Gloudeman teaches "coupling the computer
statements for implementing control logic of application definition data to another
application through an operating system communication component for supporting
application communication through the operating system" (Col. 4, lines 58-Col.5, lines 1-
9).

For claim 22, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give
above for rejected claim 21 above. Gloudeman teaches "wherein the operating system
common component coupling includes coupling a Windows-based communication
component to the computer statements for implementing control logic of application
definition data" (Col. 4, lines 12-24, Col. 4, lines 58-Col.5, lines 1-9).

For claims 23, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given
above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected.

For claims 24, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given
above for rejected claim 10 and is similarly rejected.

For claim 25, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give

above for rejected claim 15 above. Gloudeman teaches coupling external data sources to

the database" (Col. 4, lines 58-Col. 5, lines 1-9).

For claim 26, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give

above for rejected claim 25 above. Gloudeman teaches "converting data from a native

format for an external data source to one that is compatible with the database" (Col. 4, lines

6-11).

For claim 27, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give

above for rejected claim 26 above. Gloudeman teaches "generating instructions for the

database API to store the converted data in the database" (Col.5, lines 39-60).

For claim 28, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given

above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or

described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject

matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a

whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be

negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Balakrishnan, Prabaharan. (Patent No. 6,711,579) in view of Gloudeman et al. (Patent

No. 6,141, 595), further in the view of Bakalash et al. (Pub No. 2003/0229652)

hereinafter "Bakalash".

For claims 4 and 18, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the

argument give above for rejected claims 3 and 17 above. Balakrishnan and Gloudeman

do not explicitly teaches "the data mart being configured in one of a snowflake and star

data organization".

However, Bakalash teaches "the data mart being configured in one of a snowflake and star

data organization" (see paragraph [0059-0060], [0073], fig. 18A&B]).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention

to combine Balakrishnan's teachings and Gloudeman's teachings of database been

comprised of real-time database with Bakalash's teachings of database being configured in

a star schema, wherein datamart could also be a database, star schema and summary

tables are also a means of storing data based on a set of know database and database

dimension. Wherein the summary tables are in essence additional fact tables and they are

attached to the basic fact table creating a snowflakes extension of the star schema. Star

schema is well known in the art for organizing data, wherein real-time data store is a fast

and effective way of retrieving data. Therefore combining Balakrishnan and Gloudeman's

teachings with Backlash will enhance retrieving of building system data, faster when

demanded by the user.

CONCLUSION

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 10.00-6.30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIM VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

OLUBUSOLA ONI
Examiner
Art Unit 2168